REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 3, 13, 16 and 27 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Bogatz. The Examiner acknowledged that Briles fails to disclose a continuous annular well where the insert has an external diameter no greater than the diameter of the well. Bogatz was cited as disclosing a fastener having a continuous annular well receiving a sealing insert. Bogatz discloses a sealing nut with flat hexagonal sides and a groove formed in a lower face of the nut for receiving an O-ring. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite "a base portion flaring smoothly outwardly from the main cylindrical body portion to form a concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar." Claim 27 has similarly been amended to recite "a base portion flaring smoothly outwardly from the main cylindrical body portion to form a concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar," as well as "a swage tool having an interior bore which necks down smoothly to a relatively narrow convex rounded surface engaging said external surface of said cylindrical main body portion of said swage collar and said concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar." Support for the amendments can be found in the description at page 5, line 15, page 7, lines 22-24, and Figs. 1-3, 6A, 6B and 7D. As is illustrated in Figs. 1, 2 and 4 of Briles, the external surface of the nut 12 abruptly flares outwardly at 20, forming a stepped shoulder. The external surfaces of the

sealing nuts of Briles and Bogatz are quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar of the present invention. As is now recited in Claim 27, the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar cooperates with the relatively narrow convex rounded surface of the interior bore of the swaging tool. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 patentably distinguish the combination of Briles and Bogatz, and that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Bogatz should be withdrawn.

Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles (modified by Bogatz) in view of Armour, cited to disclose a process in which a collar having an internal diameter larger than a pin is positioned on the pin, then plastically deformed inwardly to engage the shaft of the pin by a swaging tool. Claim 27 has been amended to recite "a base portion flaring smoothly outwardly from the main cylindrical body portion to form a concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar," as well as "a swage tool having an interior bore which necks down smoothly to a relatively narrow convex rounded surface engaging said external surface of said cylindrical main body portion of said swage collar and said concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar." Armour discloses a collar 20 with a beveled external surface that is engaged by a correspondingly beveled surface of the inner bore of the swaging tool. The external surfaces of the sealing nuts of Briles and Bogatz are quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar of the present invention, and the external surface of the collar

and the internal surface of the swaging tool of Armour are also quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar and corresponding relatively narrow convex rounded surface of the interior bore of the swaging tool of the present invention. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 patentably distinguish the combination of Briles, Bogatz and Armour, and that the rejection of Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles (modified by Bogatz) in view of Armour should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles as applied to claims 1, 4, 13, 17, 27 and 28 (Briles as modified by Bogatz, and Briles as modified by Armour) and further in view of Rath, which was cited as disclosing a collar made of aluminum or titanium. The collar 10 of Rath has a cylindrical external surface, as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2. Fig. 3 of Rath shows the collar 10 with an inwardly rounded external surface, but only after deformation by being swaged in a standard manner, as is explained in Rath at column 3, lines 56-57, so that the cylindrical external surface of the collar of Rath is quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar of the present invention; the external surfaces of the sealing nuts of Briles and Bogatz are quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar of the present invention; and the external surface of the collar and the internal surface of the swaging tool of Armour are also quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar and corresponding relatively narrow convex rounded surface of the interior bore of the swaging tool of the present invention. Claims 5 and 6

depend from Claim 1, Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 13, and Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 27. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 patentably distinguish the combination of Briles, Bogatz, Armour and Rath, and that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles as applied to claims 1, 4, 13, 17, 27 and 28 and further in view of Rath should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles as applied to claims 1, 2, 13 and 15, further in view of Breed, which was cited as disclosing a rounded groove and flange. Claims 2 and 15 were cancelled in the amendment of May 2, 2005, and Claims 2 and 15 were not rejected in the present Office Action, so that the grounds of rejection are unclear. Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 13. Breed discloses a nut with a base having an external surface angling abruptly outward, which is quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar of the present invention. The external surfaces of the sealing nuts of Briles and Bogatz are also quite different from the concave rounded shoulder in the external surface of the swage collar of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 patentably distinguish the combination of Briles, Bogatz and Breed, and that the rejection of Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles as applied to claims 1, 2, 13 and 15, further in view of Breed should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in

this regard is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or fees in connection with this amendment to Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: /James W. Paul/
James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/eab

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201

179118.1